

**DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS**

**DIVISION OF ST. CROIX**

**CORDEN WILLIAMS,**

**Plaintiff,**

**2006-CV-0127**

**v.**

**VIRGIN ISLANDS TELEPHONE  
CORPORATION (VITELCO) and  
INNOVATIVE COMMUNICATION  
CORPORATION,**

**Defendants.**

**TO: Lee J. Rohn, Esq.  
Kevin A. Rames, Esq.**

**ORDER**

THIS MATTER came before the Court for consideration upon Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Motion to Amend Answer and the Amended Answer (Docket No. 30) and Motion to Reconsider Order Allowing Amendment and to Strike Motion to Amend Answer and the Amended Answer (Docket No. 31). The time for filing a response has expired.

A review of the record reflects that by text-entry only Order (Docket No. 22), the Court granted Defendant Innovative Communication Corporation's Motion For Commencement of Action Under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code; Automatic Stay (Docket No. 13) and Plaintiff's motions to sever Defendant Innovative



*Williams v. VITELCO*

2006-CV-0127

Order

Page 2

Communication Corporation (Docket No. 18). Thereafter, Defendants filed a Motion to Amend Answer (Docket No. 26) and an Amended Answer (Docket No. 27). Despite the title of Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider (Docket No. 31), the record is void of any order allowing amendment. Consequently, the Court will deny said motion as moot. However, because the Motion to Amend Answer and Amended Answer were filed on behalf of both Defendants<sup>1</sup>, the Court will grant Plaintiff's motion to strike the motion and amended answer.

Accordingly, it is now hereby **ORDERED**:

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Motion to Amend Answer and the Amended Answer (Docket No. 30) is **GRANTED**.
2. Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider Order Allowing Amendment and to Strike Motion to Amend Answer and the Amended Answer (Docket No. 31) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.
3. Defendants' Motion to Amend Answer (Docket No. 26) and Amended Answer (Docket No. 27) are **STRICKEN**.

---

1. The motion and proposed amended answer also purport to be filed on behalf of Defendant David Sharp. The Court is unaware of any such defendant in this matter.



*Williams v. VITELCO*

2006-CV-0127

Order

Page 3

ENTER:

Dated: March 19, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
GEORGE W. CANNON, JR.  
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE